

Countable imaginary simple unidimensional theories

Ziv Shami
Tel Aviv University

September 29, 2009

Abstract

We prove that a countable simple unidimensional theory that eliminates hyperimaginaries is supersimple. This solves a problem of Shelah in the more general context of simple theories under weak assumptions.

1 Introduction

The notion of a unidimensional theory already appeared, in a different form, in Baldwin-Lachlan characterization of $\aleph_1$ -categorical theories; a countable theory is $\aleph_1$ -categorical iff it is ω -stable and has no Vaughtian pairs (equivalently, T is ω -stable and unidimensional). Later, Shelah defined a unidimensional theory to be a stable theory T in which any two $|T|^+$ -saturated models of the same power are isomorphic, and proved that in the stable context a theory is unidimensional iff any two non-algebraic types are non-orthogonal. A problem posed by Shelah was whether any unidimensional stable theory is superstable. This was answered positively by Hrushovski around 1986 first in the countable case [H0] and then in full generality [H1]. Taking the right hand side of Shelah characterization of unidimensional stable theories seems natural for the simple case. Shelah's problem extended to this context seems much harder. In [S3] it was observed that a small simple unidimensional theory is supersimple. Later, Pillay [P] gave a positive answer for countable imaginary simple theories with wnfcp (the weak non finite cover property), building on the arguments in [H0] and using some machinery from [BPV].

Then using the result on elimination of $\exists^\infty$ in simple unidimensional theories [S1] completed his proof for countable imaginary low theories [P1].

In this paper we prove the result for any countable imaginary simple theory. One of the key notions that will take place in this paper is the forking topology. For variables x and set A the forking topology on $S_x(A)$ is defined as the topology whose basis is the collection of all sets of the form $\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \phi(a, y) \text{ forks over } A\}$, where $\phi(x, y) \in L(A)$. These topologies were defined in [S2] (the τ^f -topologies) and are variants of Hrushovski's [H0] and later Pillay's [P] topologies. The main role of Hrushovski's and Pillay's topologies in their proof was the ability to express the relation $\Gamma_F(x)$ defined by $\Gamma_F(x) = \exists y(F(x, y) \wedge y \perp x)$ as a closed relation for any Stone-closed relation $F(x, y)$. Indeed, using this and a property of T , we call PCFT, that says these topologies are closed under projections, they proved the existence of an unbounded τ^f -open set of bounded finite SU -rank in any countable imaginary unidimensional stable/low theory. From this, supersimplicity follows quite easily by showing that the existence of such a set in a simple theory actually implies there is a definable set of SU -rank 1. In [S2] however, the forking topologies played a different role. It is shown there, in particular, that if T is an imaginary simple unidimensional theory with PCFT then the existence of an unbounded supersimple τ^f -open set implies the theory is supersimple (supersimplicity here does not follow easily as before since we don't know there is a finite bound on the SU -rank of all types extending the supersimple τ^f -open set).

The first step of the proof in the current paper is to show that any simple unidimensional theory has PCFT. Thus, for proving the main result, it will be sufficient to show there exists an unbounded supersimple τ^f -open set. The existence of such a set is achieved via the introduction of the dividing line " T is essentially 1-based" which means every type is coordinatised by essentially 1-based types in the sense of the forking topology. In case T is not essentially 1-based we prove there is an unbounded τ^f -open set of finite SU -rank (possibly with no finite bound); this is a general dichotomy for countable imaginary simple theories. If T is essentially 1-based, the problem is reduced to the task of finding an unbounded type-definable τ^f -open set of bounded finite SU_s -rank (the foundation rank with respect to forking with stable formulas). In order to show the existence of such a set, we introduce the notion of a $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set and prove a theorem saying that in any simple theory in which the extension property is first-order, any minimal unbounded fiber in an unbounded $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set is a type-definable τ^f -open set. Then, we show that the

assumption that T is countable, imaginary, and unidimensional implies there is a minimal unbounded fiber of some $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set that has bounded finite SU_s -rank. By the above theorem we conclude that this fiber is a type-definable τ^f -open set and thus the proof of the main result is complete.

We will assume basic knowledge of simple theories as in [K1],[KP],[HKP]. A good text book on simple theories that covers much more is [W]. The notations are standard, and throughout the paper we work in a highly saturated, highly strongly-homogeneous model $\mathcal{C}$ of a complete first-order theory T in a language L . We will often work in $\mathcal{C}^{eq}$ and will not work with hyperimaginaries unless otherwise stated.

2 Preliminaries

We recall here some definitions and facts relevant for this paper. In this section T will be a simple theory and we work in $\mathcal{C}^{eq}$.

2.1 Interaction

For the rest of this section let $\mathcal{P}$ be an A -invariant set of small partial types and $p \in S(A)$. We say that p is (almost-) $\mathcal{P}$ -internal if there exists a realization a of p and there exists $B \supseteq A$ with $\begin{smallmatrix} a & \downarrow & B \\ & A & \end{smallmatrix}$ such that for some

tuple $\bar{c}$ of realizations of types in $\mathcal{P}$ that extend to types in $S(B)$ we have $a \in dcl(B, \bar{c})$ (respectively, $a \in acl(B, \bar{c})$). We say that p is analyzable in $\mathcal{P}$ if there exists a sequence $I = \langle a_i | i \leq \alpha \rangle \subseteq dcl(a_\alpha A)$, where $a_\alpha \models p$, such that $tp(a_i / A \cup \{a_j | j < i\})$ is $\mathcal{P}$ -internal for every $i \leq \alpha$. We say that p is foreign

$\mathcal{P}$ if for every $B \supseteq A$ and $a \models p$ with $\begin{smallmatrix} a & \downarrow & B \\ & A & \end{smallmatrix}$ and a realization c of a type

in $\mathcal{P}$ that extends to a type in $S(B)$, $\begin{smallmatrix} a & \downarrow & c \\ & B & \end{smallmatrix}$. Also, recall that $p \in S(A)$

is said to be *orthogonal* to some $q \in S(B)$ if for every $C \supseteq A \cup B$, for every $\bar{p} \in S(C)$, a non-forking extension of p , and every $\bar{q} \in S(C)$, a non-forking

extension of q , for every realization a of $\bar{p}$ and realization b of $\bar{q}$, $\begin{smallmatrix} a & \downarrow & b \\ & C & \end{smallmatrix}$.

The above definitions are valid for hyperimaginaries as well. Note that in the hyperimaginary context we say that p is analyzable in $\mathcal{P}$ (by hyperimaginaries) if there exists a sequence $I \subseteq dcl(a_\alpha A)$ as above of hyperimaginaries.

We say that T is *imaginary* (or *has elimination of hyperimaginaries*) if for every type-definable over $\emptyset$ equivalence relation E on a complete type q (of a possibly infinite tuple of elements), E is equivalent on q to the intersection of some definable equivalence relations $E_i \in L$.

Fact 2.1 1) Assume T is imaginary. If p is not foreign to $\mathcal{P}$, then for $a \models p$ there exists $a' \in \text{dcl}(Aa) \setminus \text{acl}(A)$ such that $\text{tp}(a'/A)$ is $\mathcal{P}$ -internal.
2) Assume T is imaginary. Then p is analyzable in $\mathcal{P}$ iff every non-algebraic extension of p is non-foreign to $\mathcal{P}$.
3) For a general simple theory 1) and 2) are true in the hyperimaginary context (where "non-algebraic" is replaced by "unbounded").

An easy fact we will be using is the following.

Fact 2.2 Assume $\text{tp}(a_i)$ are $\mathcal{P}$ -internal for $i < \alpha$. Then $\text{tp}(\langle a_i | i < \alpha \rangle)$ is $\mathcal{P}$ -internal.

An important characterization of almost-internality is the following fact [S0, Theorem 5.6.] (a similar result obtained independently in [W, Proposition 3.4.9]).

Fact 2.3 Let $p \in S(A)$ be an amalgamation base and let $\mathcal{U}$ be an A -invariant set. Suppose p is almost- $\mathcal{U}$ -internal. Then there is a Morley sequence $\bar{a}$ in p and there is a definable relation $R(x, \bar{y}, \bar{a})$ (over $\bar{a}$ only) such that, for every tuple $\bar{c}$, $R(\bar{c}, \bar{c}, \bar{a})$ is finite and for every a' realizing p , there is some tuple $\bar{c}$ from $\mathcal{U}$ such that $R(a', \bar{c}, \bar{a})$ holds.

T is said to be *unidimensional* if whenever p and q are complete non-algebraic types, p and q are non-orthogonal. An A -invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ is called supersimple if $SU(a/A) < \infty$ for every $a \in \mathcal{U}$. From Fact 2.3 and Fact 2.1 it is easy to deduce the following (using compactness).

Fact 2.4 Let T be a simple theory. Let $p \in S(\emptyset)$ and let $\theta \in L$. Assume p is analyzable in θ^C . Then p is analyzable in θ^C in finitely many steps. In particular, if T is an imaginary simple unidimensional theory and there exists a non-algebraic supersimple definable set, then T has finite SU -rank, i.e. every complete type has finite SU -rank (in fact, for every given sort there is a finite bound on the SU -rank of all types in that sort).

2.2 The forking topology

Definition 2.5 Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. An invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ over A is said to be a *basic τ^f -open set over A* if there is $\phi(x, y) \in L(A)$ such that

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \phi(a, y) \text{ forks over } A\}.$$

Note that the family of basic τ^f -open sets over A is closed under finite intersections, thus form a basis for a unique topology on $S_x(A)$.

Definition 2.6 We say that *the τ^f -topologies over A are closed under projections* (T is PCFT over A) if for every τ^f -open set $\mathcal{U}(x, y)$ over A the set $\exists y \mathcal{U}(x, y)$ is a τ^f -open set over A . We say that *the τ^f -topologies are closed under projections* (T is PCFT) if they are over every set A .

We will make an essential use of the following facts from [S2].

Fact 2.7 Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a τ^f -open set over a set A and let $B \supseteq A$ be any set. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is τ^f -open over B .

We say that an A -invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ has SU -rank α and write $SU(\mathcal{U}) = \alpha$ if $\text{Max}\{SU(p) \mid p \in S(A), p^c \subseteq \mathcal{U}\} = \alpha$. We say that an A -invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU -rank if there exists $n < \omega$ such that $SU(\mathcal{U}) = n$.

Fact 2.8 Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an unbounded τ^f -open set over some set A . Assume $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU -rank. Then there exists a set $B \supseteq A$ and $\theta(x) \in L(B)$ of SU -rank 1 such that $\theta^c \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cup \text{acl}(B)$.

The following theorem [S2, Theorem 3.11] generalizes Fact 2.4 but at the price of PCFT.

Fact 2.9 Assume T is a simple theory with PCFT. Let $p \in S(A)$ and let $\mathcal{U}$ be a τ^f -open set over A . Suppose p is analyzable in $\mathcal{U}$. Then p is analyzable in $\mathcal{U}$ in finitely many steps.

3 Unidimensionality and PCFT

In [BPV] it is defined when in a simple theory the extension property is first-order. Pillay [P1] proved, using the result on the elimination of the $\exists^\infty$ [S1], that in any unidimensional simple theory the extension property is first-order. Here we show that if T is any simple theory in which the extension property is first-order then T is PCFT. We conclude that any unidimensional simple theory is PCFT. From this we obtain, by Fact 2.9, the first step towards the main result, namely, the existence of an unbounded τ^f -open set that is supersimple in an imaginary simple unidimensional theory implies T is supersimple. In this section T is assumed to be simple, and if not stated otherwise, we work in $\mathcal{C}$, however we start with some notions that we will need for hyperimaginaries.

First, we introduce some natural extensions of notions from [BPV]. By a pair (M, P^M) of T we mean an $L_P = L \cup \{P\}$ -structure, where M is a model of T and P is a new predicate symbol whose interpretation is an elementary submodel of M . For the rest of this section, by a $|T|$ -small type we mean a complete hyperimaginary type in $\leq |T|$ variables over a hyperimaginary of length $\leq |T|$.

Definition 3.1 *Let $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1$ be $\emptyset$ -invariant families of $|T|$ -small types.*

1) *We say that a pair (M, P^M) satisfies the extension property for $\mathcal{P}_0$ if for every L -type $p \in S(A)$, $A \in \text{dcl}(M)$ with $p \in \mathcal{P}_0$ there is $a \in p^M$ such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \downarrow & P^M \\ & A & \end{array}.$$

2) *Let*

$$T_{\text{Ext}, \mathcal{P}_0} = \bigcap \{ \text{Th}_{L_P}(M, P^M) \mid \text{the pair } (M, P^M) \text{ satisfies the extension property w.r.t. } \mathcal{P}_0 \}.$$

3) *We say that $\mathcal{P}_0$ dominates $\mathcal{P}_1$ w.r.t. the extension property if (M, P^M) satisfies the extension property for $\mathcal{P}_1$ for every $|T|^+$ -saturated pair $(M, P^M) \models T_{\text{Ext}, \mathcal{P}_0}$. In this case we write $\mathcal{P}_0 \supseteq_{\text{Ext}} \mathcal{P}_1$.*

4) *We say that the extension property is first-order for $\mathcal{P}_0$ if $\mathcal{P}_0 \supseteq_{\text{Ext}} \mathcal{P}_0$. We say that the extension property is first-order if the extension property is first-order for the family of all $|T|$ -small types (equivalently, for the family of all real types over sets of size $\leq |T|$).*

Fact 3.2 [BPV, Proposition 4.5] *The extension property is first-order in T iff for every formulas $\phi(x, y), \psi(y, z) \in L$ the relation $Q_{\phi, \psi}$ defined by:*

$$Q_{\phi, \psi}(a) \text{ iff } \phi(x, b) \text{ doesn't fork over } a \text{ for every } b \models \psi(y, a)$$

is type-definable (here a can be an infinite tuple from $\mathcal{C}$ whose sorts are fixed).

Now, recall the following two facts and their corollary. First, let $\mathcal{P}^{SU \leq 1}$ denote the class of complete types over sets of size $\leq |T|$, of SU -rank ≤ 1 .

Fact 3.3 [P1] *Let T be a simple theory that eliminates $\exists^\infty$. Moreover, assume every non-algebraic type is non-foreign to $\mathcal{P}^{SU \leq 1}$. Then the extension property is first-order in T .*

Fact 3.4 [S1] *Let T be any unidimensional simple theory. Then T eliminates $\exists^\infty$.*

Corollary 3.5 *In any unidimensional simple theory the extension property is first-order.*

Here we give an easy generalization of Fact 3.3. For an $\emptyset$ -invariant family $\mathcal{P}_0$ of $|T|$ -small types we say that $\mathcal{P}_0$ is *extension-closed* if for all $p \in \mathcal{P}_0$ if $\bar{p}$ is any extension of p to a $|T|$ -small type, then $\bar{p} \in \mathcal{P}_0$. First, we need an easy remark.

Remark 3.6 1) *Assume a is a hyperimaginary of length $\leq |T|$, and B is a small set of hyperimaginaries. Assume $a \in dcl(B)$. Then there exists $B_0 \subseteq B$ of size $\leq |T|$ such that $a \in dcl(B_0)$.*

2) *If a is a hyperimaginary of length $\leq |T|$ and $b \in dcl(a)$ is arbitrary hyperimaginary then b is interdefinable with a hyperimaginary of length $\leq |T|$.*

Proof: 1) First, note there are hyperimaginaries of countable length $a_i = \bar{a}_i/E_i$, for $i \in |T|$, where each E_i is a type-definable equivalence relation over $\emptyset$ that consists of countably many formulas such that a is interdefinable with $(a_i | i \in |T|)$ (by repeated applications of compactness). Thus we may assume that $a \in dcl(B)$ and $a = \bar{a}/E$ where the length of $\bar{a}$ is countable and E consists of countably many formulas. Indeed, assuming this, we get that $tp(a/B) \vdash E(x, \bar{a})$. Thus, by compactness, for every formula $\psi(x) \in E(x, \bar{a})$ there is a formula $\phi(x) \in tp(a/B)$, such that $\phi(x) \vdash \psi(x)$, in particular there is a countable $B_0 \subseteq B$ such that $tp(a/B_0) \vdash E(x, \bar{a})$. Hence $a \in dcl(B_0)$. 2) is easy and left to the reader.

Lemma 3.7 *Let $\mathcal{P}_0$ be an $\emptyset$ -invariant family of $|T|$ -small types. Assume $\mathcal{P}_0$ is extension-closed and that the extension property is first-order for $\mathcal{P}_0$. Let $\mathcal{P}^*$ be the maximal class of $|T|$ -small types such that $\mathcal{P}_0 \sqsupseteq_{Ext} \mathcal{P}^*$. Then $\mathcal{P}^* \supseteq An(\mathcal{P}_0)$, where $An(\mathcal{P}_0)$ denotes the class of all $|T|$ -small types analyzable in $\mathcal{P}_0$ by hyperimaginaries.*

Proof: Note that if the pair (M, P^M) satisfies the extension property for the family of $\emptyset$ -conjugates of a hyperimaginary type $tp(b/A)$ and for the family of $\emptyset$ -conjugates of some hyperimaginary type $tp(a/bA)$ then (M, P^M) satisfies the extension property for the family of $\emptyset$ -conjugates of $tp(ab/A)$. Thus, since $\mathcal{P}_0$ is extension-closed and the extension property is first-order for $\mathcal{P}_0$ we conclude that if B is any hyperimaginary of length $\leq |T|$ and $\bar{a}$ is a tuple of of length $\leq |T|$ of realizations of some types from $\mathcal{P}_0$ over B , then if (M, P^M) is a $|T|^+$ -saturated pair and $(M, P^M) \models T_{Ext, \mathcal{P}_0}$ then (M, P^M) satisfies the extension property for the family of $\emptyset$ -conjugates of $tp(\bar{a}/B)$. Now, assume $tp(a/A)$ is a $|T|$ -small type that is $\mathcal{P}_0$ -internal. There is a set B with $A \in dcl(B)$ such that a is independent from B over A and there is a tuple of realizations $\bar{c}$ of types from $\mathcal{P}_0$ over B such that $a \in dcl(B\bar{c})$. By Remark 3.6(1), we may assume both B and $\bar{c}$ are of length $\leq |T|$. By the previous observation, $tp(\bar{c}/B) \in \mathcal{P}^*$. Since $a \in dcl(B\bar{c})$, and a is independent from B over A we conclude $tp(a/A) \in \mathcal{P}^*$. Now, assume $tp(a/A)$ is a $|T|$ -small type that is analyzable in $\mathcal{P}_0$ by hyperimaginaries. By repeated applications of Fact 2.1 in the hyperimaginary context and Remark 3.6(2), for some $\alpha < |T|^+$ there exists a sequence $(a_i | i \leq \alpha) \subseteq dcl(aA)$ of hyperimaginaries of length $\leq |T|$ such that $a_\alpha = a$ and such that $tp(a_i / \{a_j | j < i\} \cup A)$ is $\mathcal{P}_0$ -internal for every $i \leq \alpha$. By the previous observation $tp(a_i / \{a_j | j < i\} \cup A) \in \mathcal{P}^*$ for every $i \leq \alpha$. By applying the first observation inductively we get that $tp((a_i | i \leq \alpha) / A) \in \mathcal{P}^*$, and in particular $tp(a/A) \in \mathcal{P}^*$.

Remark 3.8 *Note that if T eliminates $\exists^\infty$ then the extension property is first-order for $\mathcal{P}^{SU \leq 1}$ (this was proved in [V, Proposition 2.15]). Thus Lemma 3.7 implies Fact 3.3.*

Now, we aim to show that any simple theory in which the extension property is first-order is PCFT.

Definition 3.9 *We say that T is semi-PCFT over A if for every formula $\psi(x, yz) \in L(A)$ the set $\{a | \psi(x, ab) \text{ forks over } Aa \text{ for some } b\}$ is τ^f -open over A .*

Lemma 3.10 1) *If the extension property is first-order then the extension property is first-order over every set A .*
 2) *If the extension property is first-order, then T is semi-PCFT over $\emptyset$. Thus, if the extension property is first-order, then T is semi-PCFT over every set A .*

Proof: 1) Let $\phi(x, y, A), \psi(y, z, A) \in L(A)$. Let Q' be the relation defined by $Q'(a'A') \text{ iff } \phi(x, bA') \text{ doesn't fork over } a'A' \text{ for all } b \models \psi(y, a'A')$. Clearly, for all $a'A'$ we have $Q'(a'A') \text{ iff } \phi(x, bA'') \text{ doesn't fork over } a'A' \text{ for all } bA'' \text{ such that } b \models \psi(y, a'A') \text{ and } A'' = A'$ (of course, A'' can be taken to be a finite tuple and we only need to require that A'' is equal to certain coordinates of A'). By Fact 3.2 we see that Q' is type-definable. In particular, $\{a' \mid Q(a'A)\}$ is type-definable over A . Thus by Fact 3.2, the extension property is first-order over A .

2) Assume the extension property is first-order. Let $\psi(x, yz) \in L$, we need to show that the set $F = \{a \mid \psi(x, ab) \text{ doesn't fork over } a \text{ for all } b\}$ is τ^f -closed. Indeed, clearly

$$F = \{a \mid \psi(x, a'b) \text{ doesn't fork over } a \text{ for all } a'b \text{ with } a' = a\}.$$

By Fact 3.2, F is Stone-closed, in particular F is τ^f -closed.

Lemma 3.11 *Assume T is semi-PCFT over A . Then T is PCFT over A .*

Proof: We may clearly assume $A = \emptyset$. Let $\psi(x, yz) \in L$. We need to show that Γ , defined by $\Gamma(a) \text{ iff } \forall b(\psi(x, ab) \text{ doesn't fork over } \emptyset)$ is a τ^f -closed set. Let Γ^* be defined by: for all a :

$$\Gamma^*(a) \text{ iff } \bigwedge_{\phi(x,y) \in L} [\phi(x, a) \text{ forks over } \emptyset \rightarrow \forall b(\psi(x, ab) \wedge \neg \phi(x, a) \text{ doesn't fork over } a)].$$

To finish it is sufficient to prove:

Subclaim 3.12 Γ^* is τ^f -closed and $\Gamma = \Gamma^*$.

Proof: First, by our assumption Γ^* is τ^f -closed. To prove the second part, first assume $\Gamma(a)$. Then for any b there is c such that $c \perp ab$ and $\psi(c, ab)$. Thus $\Gamma^*(a)$. Assume now $\Gamma^*(a)$. Let $p_a^{ind}(x) = \bigwedge \{\neg \phi(x, a) \mid \phi(x, y) \in L, \phi(x, a) \text{ forks over } \emptyset\}$. Let b be arbitrary and let $q(x) = p_a^{ind}(x) \wedge \psi(x, ab)$. It is enough to show that $q(x)$ doesn't fork over a (since any realization of q is independent of a). Indeed, by $\Gamma^*(a)$, every finite subset of $q(x)$ doesn't fork over a , so we are done.

Corollary 3.13 *Suppose the extension property is first-order in T . Then T is PCFT.*

Combining the last two corollaries we get:

Theorem 3.14 *Let T be any unidimensional simple theory. Then T is PCFT.*

Corollary 3.15 *Let T be an imaginary simple unidimensional theory. Let $p \in S(A)$ and let $\mathcal{U}$ be an unbounded τ^f -open set over A . Then p is analyzable in $\mathcal{U}$ in finitely many steps. In particular, for such T the existence of an unbounded supersimple τ^f -open set over some set A implies T is supersimple.*

Proof: By Theorem 3.14 every unidimensional theory is PCFT. Thus by Fact 2.9 and the assumption that T is imaginary and unidimensional, if $\mathcal{U}$ is an unbounded τ^f -open set over A , then $tp(a/A)$ is analyzable in $\mathcal{U}$ in finitely many steps for every $a \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, if $\mathcal{U}$ is supersimple, $SU(a/A) < \infty$ for all $a \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus T is supersimple.

Remark 3.16 *Note that at this point we can conclude that any countable imaginary low unidimensional theory is supersimple. Indeed, by Fact 2.8 and Fact 2.4 it will be sufficient to show the existence of an unbounded τ^f -open set of bounded finite SU -rank. The existence of such a set follows by Hrushovski's Baire categoricity argument [H0] together with Theorem 3.14 applied to the τ^f -topology (see [P]). The reason this argument works is that the τ^f -topology in a low theory is a Baire space. Indeed, in a low theory basic τ^f -open sets are type-definable and therefore we have the following property: the intersection of a countable chain of basic τ^f -open sets is non-empty iff each set in the chain is non-empty. If the theory is not low we don't know the above property is true for the basic τ^f -open sets.*

4 Definability of being in the canonical base

In this section we show that in suitable setting the relation R defined by $R(e, a)$ iff $e \in acl(Cb(C/a))$ is Stone open over C for a fixed set C . This definability result will be crucial for the dichotomy theorem we will prove in the next section. In this section T is assumed to be a simple theory and all tuples and sets are assumed to be from $\mathcal{C}$, however $Cb(A/B)$, for sets A, B , is the canonical base of $Lstp(A/B)$ given as a hyperimaginary.

Definition 4.1 Let C be any set. We say that a set $\mathcal{U}$ is a basic τ_*^f -open set over C if there exists $\psi(x, y, C) \in L(C)$ such that $\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \psi(x, aC) \text{ forks over } a\}$.

First, we note the following claim:

Claim 4.2 For every e, C, a , we have $e \in \text{acl}(Cb(C/a))$ iff for every Morley sequence $(C_i \mid i < \omega)$ of $Lstp(C/a)$ we have $e \in \text{acl}(C_i \mid i < \omega)$.

Proof: Left to right follows from the well known fact that $Cb(C/a) \in \text{dcl}(C_i \mid i < \omega)$ for every Morley sequence $(C_i \mid i < \omega)$ of $Lstp(C/a)$. For the other direction, assume the right hand side. Let $(C_i \mid i < \omega \cdot 2)$ be a Morley sequence of $Lstp(C/a)$. Let $e^* = Cb(C/a)$. Then $e^* \in \text{bdd}(a)$ and thus clearly $(C_i \mid i < \omega \cdot 2)$ is a Morley sequence of $Lstp(C/e^*)$. In particular, $(C_i \mid i < \omega)$ is independent from $(C_i \mid \omega \leq i < \omega \cdot 2)$ over e^* . By our assumption, $e \in \text{acl}(C_i \mid i < \omega)$ and $e \in \text{acl}(C_i \mid \omega \leq i < \omega \cdot 2)$. Thus $e \in \text{acl}(e^*)$.

Lemma 4.3 Let C be any set and let $\mathcal{W} = \{(e, a) \mid e \in \text{acl}(Cb(C/a))\}$ (where e, a are taken from fixed sorts). Then $\mathcal{W}$ is a τ_*^f -open set over C .

Proof: First note that since T is simple, for any two sorts, if x, x' has the first sort, and y has the second sort, there exists a type-definable relation $E_L(x, x', y)$ such that for all a, a', b with the right sorts we have $E_L(a, a', b)$ iff $Lstp(a/b) = Lstp(a'/b)$. By Claim 4.2, $(e, a) \notin \mathcal{W}$ iff there exists an a -indiscernible sequence $(C_i \mid i < \omega)$ which is independent over a with $E_L(C_0, C, a)$ such that $e \notin \text{acl}(C_i \mid i < \omega)$. For each $n < \omega$, let

$$L_n = \{\bar{\psi} \mid \bar{\psi} = \{\psi_i(Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_i, y) \mid i \leq n\} \text{ for some } \psi_i \in L\}$$

(where y has the sort of the a -s in $\mathcal{W}$, and each Y_i has the sort of C). For each $n < \omega$ and $\bar{\psi} = \{\psi_i(Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_i, y) \mid i \leq n\} \in L_n$, let $\Theta_{\bar{\psi}}(x, y, Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n, C) =$

$$E_L(Y_0, C, y) \wedge I(Y_0, \dots, Y_n, y) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=0}^n \neg \psi_i(Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_i, y) \right) \wedge x \notin \text{acl}(Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n),$$

where $I(Y_0, \dots, Y_n, y)$ is the partial type saying $Y_0, \dots, Y_n$ is y -indiscernible. Note that each $\Theta_{\bar{\psi}}(x, y, Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n, C)$ is a type-definable relation over C . By compactness, $(e, a) \notin \mathcal{W}$ iff

$$\bigwedge_{\bar{\psi} = \{\psi_i\}_{i \in L_n, n < \omega}} \left[\left(\bigwedge_{i=0}^n \psi_i(Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_{i-1}, C, a) \text{ forks over } a \right) \rightarrow \exists Y_0, \dots, Y_n \Theta_{\bar{\psi}}(e, a, Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n, C) \right].$$

We see that the complement of $\mathcal{W}$ is an intersection of τ_*^f -closed sets over C (clearly, every Stone-closed set over C is τ_*^f -closed over C .)

Proposition 4.4 *Let $q(x, y) \in S(\emptyset)$ and let $\chi(x, y, z) \in L$ be such that $\models \forall y \forall z \exists^{<\infty} x \chi(x, y, z)$. Then the set*

$$\mathcal{U} = \{(e, c, b, a) \mid e \in \text{acl}(Cb(cb/a))\}$$

is relatively Stone-open inside the Stone-closed set

$$F = \{(e, c, b, a) \mid b \perp a, \models \chi(c, b, a), tp(cb) = q\}.$$

(where e is taken from a fixed sort too).

Proof: Note that since $q \in S(\emptyset)$, it is enough to show that for any fixed $c^*b^* \models q$ the set $\mathcal{U}^* = \{(e, a) \mid e \in \text{acl}(Cb(c^*b^*/a))\}$ is relatively stone-open inside

$$F^* = \{(e, a) \mid b^* \perp a, \models \chi(c^*, b^*, a)\}.$$

Now, by Lemma 4.3 we know $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a τ_*^f -open set over b^*c^* . Thus, for some $\psi_i(t_i; w, z, c^*b^*) \in L(c^*b^*)$ ($i \in I$) we have $\mathcal{U}^* = \bigcup_i \mathcal{U}_{\psi_i}^*$ where $\mathcal{U}_{\psi_i}^* = \{(e, a) \mid \psi_i(t_i; e, a, c^*b^*) \text{ forks over } ea\}$.

Subclaim 4.5 *For every $(e, a) \in F^*$ we have $(e, a) \in \mathcal{U}_{\psi_i}^*$ iff*

$$\forall d(\psi_i(d; e, a, c^*b^*) \rightarrow da \not\perp b^*) \wedge e \in \text{acl}(a).$$

Proof: Let $(e, a) \in F^*$. Assuming the left hand side we know $e \in \text{acl}(Cb(c^*b^*/a))$, hence $e \in \text{acl}(a)$. Let $d \models \psi_i(z; e, a, c^*b^*)$. If $da \perp b^*$, then $d \perp_a b^*$.

Since $(e, a) \in F^*$, $c^* \in \text{acl}(b^*a)$ implies $d \perp_{ea} b^*c^*$, contradicting $(e, a) \in \mathcal{U}_{\psi_i}^*$. Assume now the right hand side. By a way of contradiction assume there exists $d \models \psi_i(t_i; e, a, c^*b^*)$ such that $d \perp_{ea} b^*c^*$. Since $e \in \text{acl}(a)$, this is equivalent to $d \perp_a b^*c^*$. Since $(e, a) \in F^*$ this is equivalent to $da \perp b^*$, contradiction.

By Subclaim 4.5 we see that each of $\mathcal{U}_{\psi_i}^*$ and hence $\mathcal{U}^*$ is Stone-open relatively inside F^* .

5 A dichotomy for projection closed topologies

The main obstacle for proving that a countable imaginary simple unidimensional theory is supersimple is, as indicated in Remark 3.16, the lack of compactness. The goal of this section is to prove a dichotomy that will enable us to reduce the general situation to a context where compactness can be applied eventually. More specifically, we consider a general family of topologies on the Stone spaces $S_x(A)$ that refine the Stone topologies and are closed under projections (and under adding dummy variables). For any such family of topologies the dichotomy says that either there exists an unbounded invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ that is open in this topology and is supersimple, OR for any SU -rank 1 type p_0 every type analyzable in p_0 is analyzable in p_0 by essentially 1-based types by mean of our family of topologies. In this section T is assumed to be an imaginary simple theory and we work in $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{eq}$.

Definition 5.1 A family

$$\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_{x,A} \mid x \text{ is a finite sequence of variables and } A \subset \mathcal{C} \text{ is small}\}$$

is said to be a *projection closed family of topologies* if each $\Upsilon_{x,A}$ is a topology on $S_x(A)$ that refines the Stone-topology on $S_x(A)$, this family is invariant under automorphisms of $\mathcal{C}$ and change of variables by variables of the same sort, and the family is closed under product by the full Stone space $S_y(A)$ (where y is a disjoint tuple of variables) and closed by projections, namely whenever $\mathcal{U}(x, y) \in \Upsilon_{xy,A}$, $\exists y \mathcal{U}(x, y) \in \Upsilon_{x,A}$.

There are two natural examples of projections-closed families of topologies; the Stone topology and the τ^f -topology of a PCFT theory. From now on fix a projection closed family Υ of topologies.

Definition 5.2 1) A type $p \in S(A)$ is said to be *essentially 1-based over* $A_0 \subseteq A$, *by mean of* Υ if for every finite tuple $\bar{c}$ from p and for every type-definable Υ -open set $\mathcal{U}$ over $A\bar{c}$, with the property that a is independent from A over A_0 for every $a \in \mathcal{U}$, the set $\{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid Cb(a/A\bar{c}) \not\subseteq bdd(aA_0)\}$ is nowhere dense in the Stone-topology of $\mathcal{U}$. We say $p \in S(A)$ is *essentially 1-based by mean of* Υ if p is essentially 1-based over A by mean of Υ .
2) Let V be an A_0 -invariant set and let $p \in S(A_0)$. We say that p is *analyzable*

in V by essentially 1-based types by mean of Υ if there exists $a \models p$ and there exists a sequence $(a_i \mid i \leq \alpha) \subseteq dcl^{eq}(A_0 a)$ with $a_\alpha = a$ such that $tp(a_i/A_0 \cup \{a_j \mid j < i\})$ is V -internal and essentially 1-based over A_0 by mean of Υ for all $i \leq \alpha$.

Remark 5.3 Note that $p \in S(A)$ is essentially 1-based by mean of Υ iff for every finite tuple $\bar{c}$ from p and for every non-empty type-definable Υ -open set $\mathcal{U}$ over $A\bar{c}$, there exists a non-empty relatively Stone-open and Stone-dense subset χ of $\mathcal{U}$ such that $\begin{matrix} a \\ \downarrow \\ acl^{eq}(Aa) \cap acl^{eq}(A\bar{c}) \end{matrix} \bar{c}$ for all $a \in \chi$.

Intuitively, $p \in S(A)$ is essentially 1-based over a proper subset A_0 of A by mean of Υ if the canonical base of $Lstp(a/A\bar{c})$ can be pushed down to $bdd(aA_0)$ for "most" $a \in \mathcal{U}$ provided that a independent from A over A_0 for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$. This will be important for the reduction in section 7.

Example 5.4 The unique non-algebraic 1-type over $\emptyset$ in algebraically closed fields is not essentially 1-based by mean of the τ^f -topologies.

Proof: Work in a saturated algebraically closed field $\bar{K}$. Let $k_0 \leq \bar{K}$ denote the prime field, and acl denote the algebraic closure in the home sort.

First, recall that for every finite tuples $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c} \subseteq \bar{K}$ we have $\begin{matrix} \bar{a} & \downarrow & \bar{b} \\ & \bar{c} & \end{matrix}$ iff $tr.deg(k_0(\bar{a}, \bar{c})/k_0(\bar{c})) = tr.deg(k_0(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})/k_0(\bar{b}, \bar{c}))$. Now, it is known that if $c_0, c_1, a \in \bar{K}$ are algebraically independent over k_0 , and $b = c_1 a + c_0$ then $acl(ab) \cap acl(c_0 c_1) = acl(\emptyset)$, $tr.deg(k_0(a, b)/k_0) = 2$, and $tr.deg(k_0(a, b, c_0, c_1)/k_0(c_0, c_1)) = 1$, and therefore $\begin{matrix} ab & \downarrow & c_0 c_1 \\ & acl^{eq}(ab) \cap acl^{eq}(c_0 c_1) & \end{matrix}$ (acl can be replaced by acl^{eq} since $\bar{K}$ eliminates imaginaries). Let $p \in S(\emptyset)$ be the unique non-algebraic 1-type. Let us fix two algebraically independent realizations c_0, c_1 of p . Let $\mathcal{U}$ be defined by:

$$\mathcal{U} = \{(a, b) \in \bar{K}^2 \mid a \notin acl(c_0, c_1) \text{ and } b = c_1 a + c_0\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{U}$ is a type-definable τ^f -open set over $c_0 c_1$. The above observation shows $\mathcal{U}$ fails to satisfy the requirement in Definition 5.2(1). Thus p is not essentially-1-based by mean of the τ^f -topologies.

One of the key ideas for proving the main result is the following theorem. We say that an A -invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ has finite SU -rank if $SU(a/A) < \omega$ for every $a \in \mathcal{U}$.

Theorem 5.5 *Let T be a countable simple theory that eliminates hyperimaginaries. Let Υ be a projection-closed family of topologies. Let p_0 be a partial type over $\emptyset$ of SU -rank 1. Then, either there exists an unbounded finite- SU -rank Υ -open set over some countable set, or every type $p \in S(A)$, with A countable, that is internal in p_0 is essentially 1-based over $\emptyset$ by mean of Υ . In particular, either there exists an unbounded finite SU -rank Υ -open set, or whenever A is countable, $p \in S(A)$ and every non-algebraic extension of p is non-foreign to p_0 , p is analyzable in p_0 by essentially 1-based types by mean of Υ .*

Proof: Υ will be fixed and we'll freely omit the phrase "by mean of Υ ". To see the "In particular" part, work over A and assume that every $p' \in S(A')$, with $A' \supseteq A$ countable, that is internal in p_0 , is essentially 1-based over A . Indeed, assume $p \in S(A)$ is such that every non-algebraic extension of p is non-foreign to p_0 . Then, for $a \models p$ there exists $a' \in dcl^{eq}(Aa) \setminus acl^{eq}(A)$ such that $tp(a'/A)$ is p_0 -internal and thus essentially 1-based over A by our assumption. Since L and Aa are countable so is $dcl^{eq}(Aa)$ and thus by repeating this process we get that p is analyzable in p_0 by essentially 1-based types. We prove now the main part. Assume there exist a countable A and $p \in S(A)$ that is internal in p_0 and p is not essentially 1-based over $\emptyset$. By Fact 2.2, we may assume there exists $d \models p$, and b that is independent from d over A , and a finite tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq p_0$ such that $d \in dcl(Ab\bar{c})$, and there exists a type-definable Υ -open set $\mathcal{U}$ over Ad such that a is independent from A for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid Cb(a/Ad) \not\subseteq acl^{eq}(a)\}$ is not nowhere dense in the Stone-topology of $\mathcal{U}$. So, since Υ refines the Stone-topology, by intersecting it with a definable set, we may assume that $\{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid Cb(a/Ad) \not\subseteq acl^{eq}(a)\}$ is dense in the Stone-topology of $\mathcal{U}$. Now, for each disjoint partition $\bar{c} = \bar{c}_0\bar{c}_1$ and formula $\chi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_0, y, z) \in L(A)$ such that $(*) \forall \bar{x}_0, y, z \exists^{\leq \infty} \bar{x}_1 \chi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_0, y, z)$, let

$$F_{\chi, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1} = \{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid \exists b', \bar{c}'_0, \bar{c}'_1 \text{ s.t. } tp(b'\bar{c}'_0\bar{c}'_1/Ad) = tp(b\bar{c}_0\bar{c}_1/Ad) \text{ and } a \text{ is independent from}$$

$$b'\bar{c}'_0\bar{c}'_1 \text{ over } Ad \text{ and } \models \chi(\bar{c}'_1, \bar{c}'_0, b', a) \text{ and } a \text{ is independent from } Ab'\bar{c}'_0 \text{ over } \emptyset\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{c}}$ be the (finite) set of partitions of $\bar{c}$ into two subsets. Note that since d is independent from b over A , any $a \in \mathcal{U}$ is independent from Ab' whenever $tp(b'/Ad) = tp(b/Ad)$ and $\begin{smallmatrix} a & \perp & b' \\ & Ad & \end{smallmatrix}$. Thus, since p_0 is a partial type over

$\emptyset$ of SU -rank ≤ 1 we have

$$\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{(\bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1) \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{c}}, \chi \models (*)} F_{\chi, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1}.$$

Note that since we are fixing the type of $b'\bar{c}'_0\bar{c}'_1$ over Ad , the sets $F_{\chi, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1}$ are type-definable over Ad . Since L and A are countable, by the Baire category theorem for the Stone-topology of the closed set $\mathcal{U}$, there exists $(\bar{c}_0^*, \bar{c}_1^*) \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{c}}$ and there is $\chi^* \models (*)$ such that $F_{\chi^*, \bar{c}_0^*, \bar{c}_1^*}$ has non-empty interior in the Stone-topology of $\mathcal{U}$. Thus, we may assume that $\mathcal{U}$ is a type-definable Υ -open set over Ad such that $\{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid Cb(a/Ad) \not\subseteq acl^{eq}(a)\}$ is dense in the Stone-topology of $\mathcal{U}$ and for every $a \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists $b'\bar{c}'_0\bar{c}'_1 \models tp(b\bar{c}_0^*\bar{c}_1^*/Ad)$ that is independent from a over Ad and such that $\models \chi^*(\bar{c}'_1, \bar{c}'_0, b', a)$ and a is independent from $Ab'\bar{c}'_0$ over $\emptyset$. Let us now define a set V over Ad by

$$V = \{(\bar{c}'_0, \bar{c}'_1, b', a', e') \mid \text{if } tp(b'\bar{c}'_0\bar{c}'_1/Ad) = tp(b\bar{c}_0^*\bar{c}_1^*/Ad) \text{ and } a' \text{ is independent from } b'\bar{c}'_0\bar{c}'_1 \text{ over } Ad \text{ and } a' \text{ is independent from } Ab'\bar{c}'_0 \text{ over } \emptyset \text{ and } \models \chi^*(\bar{c}'_1, \bar{c}'_0, b', a') \text{ then } e' \in acl(Cb(Ab'\bar{c}'_0/a'))\}.$$

Let

$$V^* = \{e' \mid \exists a' \in \mathcal{U} \forall b', \bar{c}'_0, \bar{c}'_1 V(\bar{c}'_0, \bar{c}'_1, b', a', e')\}.$$

Subclaim 5.6 V^* is a Υ -open set over Ad .

Proof: By Proposition 4.4, we see that V is a Stone-open set over Ad . Note that Stone-open sets are closed under the $\forall$ quantifier (indeed, if $\mathcal{U}(x, y)$ is Stone-open, then the complement of $\forall y \mathcal{U}(x, y)$ is Stone-closed by compactness). Therefore, since the Υ topology refines the Stone-topology and closed under product by a full Stone-space and closed under projections, we conclude that V^* is a Υ -open set.

Subclaim 5.7 For appropriate sort for e' , the set V^* is unbounded and has finite SU -rank over Ad .

Proof: First, note the following.

Remark 5.8 Assume $d \in dcl(c)$. Then $Cb(d/a) \in dcl(Cb(c/a))$ for all a .

Let $a^* \in \mathcal{U}$ be such that $Cb(a^*/Ad) \not\subseteq acl^{eq}(a^*)$. Then $Cb(Ad/a^*) \not\subseteq acl^{eq}(Ad)$. By Remark 5.8, there exists $e^* \notin acl^{eq}(Ad)$ such that $e^* \in acl^{eq}(Cb(Ab'\vec{c}'_0\vec{c}'_1/a^*))$ for all $b'\vec{c}'_0\vec{c}'_1 \models tp(b\vec{c}_0\vec{c}_1/Ad)$. In particular, $e^* \in V^*$. Thus, if we fix the sort for e' in the definition of V^* to be the sort of e^* , then V^* is unbounded. Now, let $e' \in V^*$. Then for some $a' \in \mathcal{U}$, $\models V(\vec{c}'_0, \vec{c}'_1, b', a', e')$ for all $b', \vec{c}'_0, \vec{c}'_1$. By what we saw above, there exists $b'\vec{c}'_0\vec{c}'_1 \models tp(b\vec{c}_0\vec{c}_1/Ad)$ that is independent from a' over Ad such that $\models \chi^*(\vec{c}'_1, \vec{c}'_0, b', a')$ and a' is independent from $Ab'\vec{c}'_0$ over $\emptyset$. Thus, by the definition of V^* , $e' \in acl(Cb(Ab'\vec{c}'_0\vec{c}'_1/a'))$. Since Ab' is independent from a' over $\emptyset$, $tp(e')$ is almost- p_0 -internal, and thus $SU(e') < \omega$. In particular, $SU(e'/Ad) < \omega$.

Thus V^* is the required set.

6 Stable dependence

We introduce the relation stable dependence and show it is symmetric. In this section T is assumed to be a complete theory unless otherwise stated, and we work in $\mathcal{C}^{eq}$.

Definition 6.1 *Let $a \in \mathcal{C}$, $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. We say that a is stably-independent from B over A if for every stable $\phi(x, y) \in L$, if $\phi(x, b)$ is over B (i.e. the canonical parameter of $\phi(x, b)$ is in $dcl(B)$) and $a' \models \phi(x, b)$ for some $a' \in dcl(Aa)$, then $\phi(x, b)$ doesn't divide over A . In this case we denote it by*

$$a \underset{A}{\downarrow_S} B.$$

We will need some basic facts from local stability [HP]. From now on we fix a stable formula $\phi(x, y)$. A formula $\psi \in L(\mathcal{C})$ is said to be a ϕ -formula over A if it is a finite boolean combination of instances of ϕ , that is equivalent to a formula with parameters from A . A complete ϕ -type over A is a consistent complete set of ϕ -formulas over A . $S_\phi(A)$ denotes the set of complete ϕ -types over A . Note that if M is a model then every $p \in S_\phi(M)$ is determined by the set $\{\psi \in p \mid \psi = \phi(x, a) \text{ or } \psi = \neg\phi(x, a) \text{ for } a \in M\}$ (in fact, it is easy to see that every ϕ -formula over M is equivalent to a ϕ -formula whose parameters are from M). Recall the following well known facts.

Fact 6.2 *Let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be stable. Then*

- 1) [HP, Lemma 5.4(i)] *For any model M , every $p \in S_\phi(M)$ is definable.*
- 2) [HP, Lemma 5.5] *Let A be any set, let $p \in S(A)$, and let $M \supseteq A$ be a model. Then there exists $q \in S_\phi(M)$ that is consistent with p and is definable over $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$.*
- 3) [HP, Lemma 5.8] *Let $A = \text{acl}(A)$. Let $p \in S_\phi(A)$. Then for every model $M \supseteq A$, there is a unique $\bar{p} \in S_\phi(M)$ that extends p and such that $\bar{p}$ is definable over A (i.e. its ϕ -definition is over A). Moreover, there is a canonical formula over A that is the definition of any such $\bar{p}$ over any such model M .*
- 4) [HP, Lemma 5.9] *Assume $p, q \in S_\phi(\text{acl}(A))$ are such that $p|_A = q|_A$. Then there exists $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}/A)$ such that $\sigma(p) = q$.*

The following definition is standard.

Definition 6.3 *Let $p \in S_\phi(B)$ and let $A \subseteq B$. We say that p doesn't fork over A in the sense of local stability (=LS) if for some model M containing B and some $\bar{p} \in S_\phi(M)$ that extends p , $\bar{p}$ is definable over $\text{acl}(A)$.*

Claim 6.4 *Let T be simple. Let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be stable. Assume $a \downarrow_A b$ and $a' \downarrow_A b$ and $\text{Lstp}(a/A) = \text{Lstp}(a'/A)$. Then $\phi(a, b)$ iff $\phi(a', b)$.*

Proof: By definition, $\text{Lstp}(a/A) = \text{Lstp}(a'/A)$ iff there exist $a_0 = a, \dots, a_n = a'$ such that for every $i < n$ there is an infinite A -indiscernible sequence containing (a_i, a_{i+1}) . By extension, transitivity, and symmetry, we may assume $n = 1$ and b is independent from aa' over A . Let $(c_i | i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})$ ($\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the integers) be an A -indiscernible sequence such that $c_{-1} = a$ and $c_1 = a'$. Since $I = (c_{-i}c_i | i \in \omega \setminus \{0\})$ is A -indiscernible and b is independent from aa' over A , we may assume I is indiscernible over Ab . We claim $\phi(a, b)$ iff $\phi(a', b)$. Indeed, otherwise we get $\phi(c_i, b) \leftrightarrow \phi(c_j, b)$ iff i, j have the same sign; a contradiction to stability of $\phi(x, y)$.

The following lemma is easy but important.

Lemma 6.5 *Assume T is a simple theory in which $\text{Lstp} = \text{stp}$ over sets and let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be stable. Then for all a and $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\text{tp}_\phi(a/B)$ doesn't fork over A in the sense of LS iff $\text{tp}_\phi(a/B)$ doesn't fork over A .*

Proof: Assume $p_\phi = tp_\phi(a/B)$ doesn't fork over A in the sense of LS. Extend it to a complete ϕ -type $\bar{p}_\phi$ over a sufficiently saturated and sufficiently strongly-homogeneous model $\mathcal{M}$ that is definable over $acl(A)$. If $tp_\phi(a/B)$ divide over A , there is an $acl(A)$ -indiscernible sequence $(B_i | i < \omega) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ such that if $p_{B_i}^\phi$ are the corresponding $acl(A)$ -conjugates of p_ϕ , then $\bigwedge_i p_{B_i}^\phi = \emptyset$. By the uniqueness of non-forking extensions (in the sense of LS) of complete ϕ -types over algebraically closed sets (and the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ is sufficiently strongly-homogeneous) we conclude that $\bar{p}_\phi$ extends each $p_{B_i}^\phi$, a contradiction. For the other direction, assume $p_\phi = tp_\phi(a/B)$ doesn't fork over A . Let $\mathcal{M} \supseteq B$ be a sufficiently saturated and sufficiently strongly homogeneous model. Let $\bar{p} \in S(\mathcal{M})$ be an extension of p_ϕ that doesn't fork over A . Let $\psi(y, c) \in L(\mathcal{M})$ be the definition of $\bar{p}|_\phi$ (where c is the canonical parameter of ψ). We claim that $c \in acl(A)$. Indeed, otherwise let $\sigma \in Aut(\mathcal{M}/acl(A))$ be such that $\sigma c \neq c$. So, $\bar{p}, \sigma(\bar{p})$ have different ϕ -definitions, a contradiction to Claim 6.4.

Corollary 6.6 *Let T be a simple theory in which $Lstp = stp$ over sets. Then for all $a, A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ we have $a \downarrow_A^s B$ iff $tp_\phi(a'/B)$ doesn't fork over A in the sense of LS for every stable $\phi(x, y) \in L$ and every $a' \in dcl(aA)$.*

Given $a, A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we will say that $tp(a/B)$ doesn't fork over A in the sense of LS if the right hand side of Corollary 6.6 holds.

Lemma 6.7 *Let T be a simple theory in which $Lstp = stp$ over sets. Then 1) stable independence is a symmetric relation, that is, for all a, b, A we have $a \downarrow_A^s Ab$ iff $b \downarrow_A^s Aa$.*

2) *For all $a, A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, if $a \downarrow_A^s B$ and $a \downarrow_B^s C$, then $a \downarrow_A^s C$. In fact, in any theory the same is true in the sense of LS.*

Proof: To prove 1), first note the following.

Subclaim 6.8 *Let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be stable and let $a, a' \in \mathcal{C}$ and let $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Assume $tp_\phi(a/A) = tp_\phi(a'/A)$. Then $\phi(a, y)$ forks over A iff $\phi(a', y)$ forks over A .*

Proof: Otherwise, there are $p, q \in S(\mathcal{C})$, both extends $tp_\phi(a/A) = tp_\phi(a'/A)$, and do not fork over A such that p represent $\phi(x, y)$ (namely, for some $b \in M$, $\phi(x, b) \in p$) and q doesn't represent $\phi(x, y)$. By Fact 6.2 (4), $(p|\phi)|acl(A)$ and $(q|\phi)|acl(A)$ are A -conjugate. Let $\sigma \in Aut(\mathcal{C}/A)$ be such that $\sigma((p|\phi)|acl(A)) = (q|\phi)|acl(A)$. Now, both $\sigma(p|\phi)$ and $q|\phi$ extend $(q|\phi)|acl(A)$ and doesn't fork over $acl(A)$, and therefore by Lemma 6.5, both doesn't fork over $acl(A)$ in the sense of LS. By Fact 6.2 (3), $\sigma(p|\phi) = q|\phi$, which is a contradiction.

We prove symmetry. Assume $a \not\downarrow^s_A Ab$. To show $b \not\downarrow^s_A Aa$, let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be stable such that $\phi(b', a')$ for some $b' \in dcl(Ab)$ and some $a' \in dcl(Aa)$. Let $\tilde{\phi}(y, x) = \phi(x, y)$. By the assumption, $tp_{\tilde{\phi}}(a'/Ab)$ doesn't fork over A (in the usual sense), so there exists $a'' \models tp_{\tilde{\phi}}(a'/Ab)$ such that $a'' \not\downarrow_A Ab$. Let $(a''_i | i < \omega)$ be a Morley sequence of $tp(a''/Ab)$. Now, $b' \models \bigwedge_{i < \omega} \phi(x, a''_i)$. Thus $\phi(x, a'')$ doesn't fork over A . By Subclaim 6.8, $\phi(x, a')$ doesn't fork over A . 2) is immediate by Corollary 6.6 and the fact that the relation of being a non-forking extension in the LS sense is a transitive relation on complete ϕ -types (where ϕ is a fixed stable formula).

7 An unbounded τ_∞^f -open set of bounded finite SU_s -rank is sufficient

In this section we apply the dichotomy theorem from section 5 in order to reduce the problem on supersimplicity of countable imaginary simple unidimensional theories to the problem of finding a τ_∞^f -open set of finite SU_s -rank (over a finite set). In this section T is an imaginary simple theory. We work in $\mathcal{C}^{eq}$.

Definition 7.1 1) For $a \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ the SU_s -rank is defined by induction on α : if $\alpha = \beta + 1$, then $SU_s(a/A) \geq \alpha$ if there exists $B \supseteq A$ such that $a \not\downarrow^s_A B$ and $SU_s(a/B) \geq \beta$. For limit α , $SU_s(a/A) \geq \alpha$ if $SU_s(a/A) \geq \beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.

2) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an A -invariant set. We write $SU_s(\mathcal{U}) = \alpha$ (the SU_s -rank of $\mathcal{U}$ is α) if $\text{Max}\{SU_s(p) | p \in S(A), p^c \subseteq \mathcal{U}\} = \alpha$. We say that $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded

finite SU_s -rank if for some $n < \omega$, $SU_s(\mathcal{U}) = n$. Note that the SU_s -rank of $\mathcal{U}$ might, a priori, depend on the choice of the set A over which $\mathcal{U}$ is invariant.

Definition 7.2 The τ_∞^f -topology on $S(A)$ is the topology whose basis is the family of type-definable τ^f -open sets over A .

Lemma 7.3 For $a \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, assume $tp(a/B)$ doesn't fork over $acl(aA) \cap acl(B)$ and $a \not\downarrow_A B$. Then $a \not\downarrow_A^s B$.

Proof: It will be sufficient to show that whenever $a \not\downarrow_A B$ and $a \downarrow_{acl(a) \cap acl(B)} B$ for some (possibly infinite) tuple a and some $A \subseteq B$, there exists a stable $\phi(x, y) \in L$ such that $\phi(a, B)$ and $\phi(x, b)$ forks over A (indeed, the above implies the following: if $aA \not\downarrow_A B$ and $aA \downarrow_{acl(aA) \cap acl(B)} B$ then there exists a stable formula $\phi(x, y) \in L$ such that $\phi(aA, B)$ and $\phi(x, B)$ forks over A , i.e. $a \not\downarrow_A^s B$). To prove this, let $E = Cb(a/B)$. Then $E \subseteq acl(a) \cap acl(B)$. By the assumption, there is $e^* \in dcl(E) \setminus acl(A)$, so $e^* \in (acl(a) \cap acl(B)) \setminus acl(A)$. Hence there are $n_0, n_1 \in \omega$ and formulas $\chi_0(x, y), \chi_1(x, z) \in L$ such that $\forall y \exists^{< n_0} x \chi_0(x, y)$ and $\forall z \exists^{< n_1} x \chi_1(x, z)$ and $\chi_0(e^*, a)$ and $\chi_1(x, B)$ isolates $tp(e^*/B)$. Let

$$\phi(y, z) \equiv \exists x (\chi_0(x, y) \wedge \chi_1(x, z)).$$

Note that $\phi(y, z)$ is stable. Indeed, otherwise there are $a \in \mathcal{C}$ and an $\emptyset$ -indiscernible sequence $B = (b_i | i \in \mathbb{Z})$ ($\mathbb{Z}$ =the integer numbers) such that $i \geq 0$ iff $\phi(a, b_i)$. Since B is indiscernible, and $\chi_1(x, b_0)$ is algebraic, $\bigcap_{i \in I} \chi_1(\mathcal{C}, b_i) = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi_1(\mathcal{C}, b_i)$ for every infinite $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. But since $\chi_0(x, a)$ is algebraic, for some infinite $I^* \subseteq \omega$, $\chi_0(\mathcal{C}, a) \cap \bigcap_{i \in I^*} \chi_1(\mathcal{C}, b_i) \neq \emptyset$. A contradiction to $\neg \phi(a, b_i)$ for $i < 0$. To see that $\phi(y, B)$ forks over A , note that otherwise there exists $a' \models \phi(y, B)$ such that $a' \downarrow_A B$, so if

$e' \models \chi_0(x, a') \wedge \chi_1(x, B)$, then on one hand $e' \downarrow_A B$ and on the other hand since $\chi_1(x, B)$ isolates $tp(e^*/B)$, $e' \in acl(B) \setminus acl(A)$ which is a contradiction.

Lemma 7.4 *Assume $\mathcal{U}$ is an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set of bounded finite SU_s -rank over some finite set A . Then there exists a τ_∞^f -open set $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ over some finite set $B^* \supseteq A$ of SU_s -rank 1.*

Proof: We may clearly assume $\mathcal{U}$ is a basic τ_∞^f -open set. Let $n = SU_s(\mathcal{U})$ ($\mathcal{U}$ is over A , and $n < \omega$). Let $a^* \in \mathcal{U}$ with $SU_s(a^*/A) = n$. Let $B \supseteq A$ be finite such that $a^* \not\downarrow_A^s B$, and $SU_s(a^*/B) = n - 1$. So, there exists $a' \in dcl(a^*A)$ and stable $\phi(x, y) \in L$ such that $\phi(a', B)$ and $\phi(x, B)$ forks over A . Let f an $\emptyset$ -definable function such that $a' = f(a^*, A)$. Let

$$\mathcal{U}' = \{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid \phi(f(a, A), B) \} \text{ (as a set over } B\text{)}.$$

Since $a^* \in \mathcal{U}'$, $SU_s(\mathcal{U}') \geq n - 1$. If $a \in \mathcal{U}'$, then $\phi(f(a, A), B)$ implies $a \not\downarrow_A^s B$ and therefore $SU_s(\mathcal{U}') \leq n - 1$. We conclude $SU_s(\mathcal{U}') = n - 1$.

Clearly, $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}'$ is type-definable. By Fact 2.7, $\mathcal{U}'$, is a τ^f -open set over B . We finish by induction.

Lemma 7.5 *Let T be a countable imaginary simple unidimensional theory. Assume there is $p_0 \in S(\emptyset)$ of SU -rank 1 and there exists an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set over some finite set of bounded finite SU_s -rank. Then T is supersimple.*

Proof: By Lemma 7.4, there exists a finite set A_0 and a τ_∞^f -open set $\mathcal{U}$ over A_0 of SU_s -rank 1. Clearly, we may assume $\mathcal{U}$ is type-definable. By Theorem 3.14, T is PCFT. Thus, working over A_0 , by Theorem 5.5 for the τ^f -topology either (i) there exists an unbounded τ^f -open set of finite SU -rank over some countable set or (ii) every non-algebraic type over A_0 is analyzable in p_0 by essentially 1-based types by mean of τ^f . By Corollary 3.15, we may assume (ii). We claim $SU(\mathcal{U}) = 1$. Indeed, otherwise there exists a and $d \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $d \not\downarrow_{A_0}^s a$ and $d \notin acl(aA_0)$. By (ii), there exists $(a_i \mid i \leq \alpha) \subseteq dcl^{eq}(aA_0)$ with $a_\alpha = a$ such that $tp(a_i/A_0 \cup \{a_j \mid j < i\})$ is essentially 1-based over A_0 by mean of τ^f for all $i \leq \alpha$. Now, let $i^* \leq \alpha$ be minimal such that there exists $d' \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying $d' \not\downarrow_{A_0}^s \{a_i \mid i \leq i^*\}$, and $d' \notin acl(A_0 \cup \{a_i \mid i \leq i^*\})$. Pick $\phi(x, a') \in L(A_0 \cup \{a_i \mid i \leq i^*\})$ that forks over A_0 and such that $\phi(d', a')$. Let

$$V = \{d \in \mathcal{U} \mid \phi(d, a') \text{ and } d \notin acl(A_0 \cup \{a_i \mid i \leq i^*\}) \}.$$

By minimality of i^* , d is independent from $\{a_i | i < i^*\}$ over A_0 for all $d \in V$. Clearly V is type-definable and by Fact 2.7, V is a τ^f -open set over $A_0 \cup \{a_i | i \leq i^*\}$. Now, since $tp(a_{i^*}/A_0 \cup \{a_i | i < i^*\})$ is essentially 1-based over A_0 by mean of τ^f , the set

$$\{d \in V \mid Cb(d/A_0 \cup \{a_i | i \leq i^*\}) \in bdd(dA_0)\}$$

contains a relatively Stone-open and Stone-dense subset of V . In particular, there exists $d^* \in V$ such that $tp(d^*/A_0 \cup \{a_i | i \leq i^*\})$ doesn't fork over $acl(A_0 d^*) \cap acl(A_0 \cup \{a_i | i \leq i^*\})$. Since we know $d^* \not\downarrow_{A_0}^s A_0 \cup \{a_i | i \leq i^*\}$,

Lemma 7.3 implies $d^* \not\downarrow_{A_0}^s A_0 \cup \{a_i | i \leq i^*\}$. Hence $d^* \in V$ implies $SU_s(d^*/A_0) \geq 2$, which contradict $SU_s(\mathcal{U}) = 1$. Thus we have proved $SU(\mathcal{U}) = 1$. Now, by Fact 2.8 there exists a definable set of SU -rank 1, and thus by Fact 2.4, T is supersimple.

Remark 7.6 *Note that if X is any Stone-closed subset of the Stone-space $S_x(T)$ and $B = \{F_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a basis for a topology τ on X that consists of Stone-closed subsets of X , then (X, τ) is a Baire space (i.e. the intersection countably many dense open sets in it is dense). In particular, the τ_∞^f -topology on $S(A)$ is Baire.*

Remark 7.7 *If we could show that for all $a, A \subseteq B \subseteq C$,*

$$a \not\downarrow_A^s C \Rightarrow a \not\downarrow_B^s C,$$

then this would imply that for $A \subseteq B$, $a \not\downarrow_A^s B$ implies $SU_s(a/A) = SU_s(a/B)$. Thus by Remark 7.6, a Baire categoricity argument applying Theorem 3.14, will imply the existence of a bounded finite SU_s -rank unbounded τ_∞^f -open set in any countable imaginary unidimensional simple theory and thus supersimplicity will follow by Lemma 7.5. Unfortunately, this seems to be false for a general simple theory without stable forking.

8 $\tilde{\tau}^f$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -sets

The problem of finding an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set of bounded finite SU_s -rank in a countable imaginary simple unidimensional theory looked simple at first.

Indeed, a Baire categoricity argument using the "independence relation" $\downarrow_S$, instead of $\downarrow$ seemed very natural but, as indicated in Remark 7.7, doesn't seem to work. The attempt to find other "independence relation" that is weaker than the usual independence relation, sufficiently definable, and preserving the SU_s -rank seemed very problematic too. The resolution of this obtained by analyzing sets of the form $U_{f,n} = \{a \in \mathcal{C}^s \mid SU_{se}(f(a)) \geq n\}$, where $n < \omega$ and f is an $\emptyset$ -definable function (SU_{se} is a variation of SU_s and will be defined later). The complements of these sets appears naturally as we assume unidimensionality; indeed, for every $a \in \mathcal{C} \setminus acl(\emptyset)$ there exists $a' \in dcl^{eq}(a) \setminus acl^{eq}(\emptyset)$ such that $SU(a') < \omega$ and in particular $SU_{se}(a') < \omega$. The sets we will analyze in this section, called $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -sets, are generalizations of local versions of the sets $U_{f,n}$. The theorem which will be crucial for the main result is that in a simple theory in which the extension property is first-order, any minimal unbounded fiber of a $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set is a τ^f -open set. In this section T is assumed to be a simple theory. We work in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 8.1 A relation $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$ is said to be a *pre- $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set relation* if there are $\theta(x, \tilde{x}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) \in L$ and $\phi_i(\tilde{x}, y_i) \in L$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$ such that for all $a, d_1, \dots, d_l \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a} [\theta(a, \tilde{a}, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^l (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_i)]$$

(for $i = 0$ the sequence $d_1 d_2 \dots d_i$ is interpreted as $\emptyset$). If each $\phi_i(\tilde{x}, y_i)$ is assumed to be stable, $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$ is said to be a *pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation*.

Definition 8.2 1) A $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set (over $\emptyset$) is a set of the form

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \exists d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l)\}$$

for some *pre- $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set relation* $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$.

2) A $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set is defined in the same way as a $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set but we add the requirement that $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$ is a *pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation*.

We will say that the formula $\phi(x, y) \in L$ is *low in x* if there exists $k < \omega$ such that for every $\emptyset$ -indiscernible sequence $(b_i \mid i < \omega)$, the set $\{\phi(x, b_i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent iff every subset of it of size k is inconsistent. Note that every stable formula $\phi(x, y)$ is low in both x and y .

Remark 8.3 Note that if $\phi(x, y) \in L$ is low in x then the relation F_ϕ defined by $F_\phi(b, A)$ iff $\phi(x, b)$ forks over A is type-definable. Thus every pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation is type-definable and every $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set is type-definable.

Lemma 8.4 Assume the extension property is first-order in T . Let $\theta(x, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be a Stone-open relation over $\emptyset$ and let $\phi_j(x, y_j) \in L$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$. Let U be the following invariant set. For all $d_1 \in \mathcal{C}$, $U(d_1)$ iff

$$\exists a \exists d_2 \dots d_n [\theta(a, d_1, \dots, d_n) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=0}^n \phi_j(a, y_j) \text{ forks over } d_1 \dots d_j].$$

Then U is a τ^f -open set over $\emptyset$. If each $\phi_j(x, y_j)$ is assumed to be low in y_j and θ is assumed to be definable, then U is a basic τ_∞^f -open set.

Proof: We prove the lemma by induction on $n \geq 1$. Consider the negation Γ of U :

$$\Gamma(d_1) \text{ iff } \forall a \forall d_2 \dots d_n (\theta(a, d_1, \dots, d_n) \rightarrow \bigvee_{j=0}^n \phi_j(a, y_j) \text{ dnfo } d_1 \dots d_j)$$

(where "dnfo" = doesn't fork over).

Subclaim 8.5 Let Γ' be defined by $\Gamma'(d_1)$ iff

$$\bigwedge_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=0}^{n-1} \in L} \forall d_2 \dots d_n [(\bigwedge_{j=0}^{n-1} \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j) \text{ forks over } d_1 \dots d_j) \rightarrow \forall a \Lambda(a, d_1, \dots, d_n)].$$

where Λ is defined by

$$\Lambda(a, d_1, \dots, d_n) \text{ iff } \theta(a, d_1, \dots, d_n) \rightarrow \bigvee_{j=0}^n \phi_j(a, y_j) \wedge \neg \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j) \text{ dnfo } d_1 \dots d_n$$

where η_n denotes a contradiction. Then $\Gamma' = \Gamma$.

Proof: Assume $\Gamma(d_1)$. Let $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-1} \in L$ and let $d_2, \dots, d_n \in \mathcal{C}$. Assume $\eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_j$ for all $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, and let $a \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\theta(a, d_1, \dots, d_n)$. By the assumption, we may assume $\phi_{j_0}(a, y_{j_0})$ doesn't fork over $d_1 \dots d_{j_0}$ for some $0 \leq j_0 \leq n-1$. Let c_{j_0} be such that $\phi_{j_0}(a, c_{j_0})$ and $a \downarrow_{d_1 \dots d_{j_0}} c_{j_0}$. By extension we may assume $a d_1 \dots d_n \downarrow_{d_1 \dots d_{j_0}} c_{j_0}$.

Since $\eta_{j_0}(d_1 \dots d_n, y_{j_0})$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_{j_0}$, we know $\neg \eta_{j_0}(d_1 \dots d_n, c_{j_0})$. Therefore $\phi_{j_0}(a, y_{j_0}) \wedge \neg \eta_{j_0}(d_1 \dots d_n, y_{j_0})$ doesn't fork over $d_1 \dots d_{j_0}$ and in particular doesn't fork over $d_1 \dots d_n$. Assume now $\Gamma'(d_1)$. Let $a, d_2, \dots, d_n \in \mathcal{C}$ and assume $\theta(a, d_1, \dots, d_n)$. It is sufficient to show that for all $0 \leq j \leq n-1$ if $\phi_j(a, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_j$, then there exists η_j such that $\eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_j$ and $\phi_j(a, y_j) \wedge \neg \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_n$. Assume otherwise. Fix j , so $\phi_j(a, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_j$ and $\phi_j(a, y_j) \wedge \neg \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j)$ doesn't fork over $d_1 \dots d_n$ for all η_j such that $\eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_j$. Let

$$\Psi(y_j) \equiv \bigwedge_{\eta_j \in F_j, \mu_j \in E_j} \phi_j(a, y_j) \wedge \neg \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j) \wedge \neg \mu_j(ad_1 \dots d_n, y_j)$$

where

$$F_j = \{\eta_j \mid \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j) \text{ forks over } d_1 \dots d_j\},$$

and

$$E_j = \{\mu_j \mid \mu_j(ad_1 \dots d_n, y_j) \text{ forks over } d_1 \dots d_n\}.$$

By our assumption and compactness, $\Psi(y_j)$ is consistent. Let $c_j \models \Psi(y_j)$. Then $\phi_j(a, c_j), \begin{array}{ccc} d_1 \dots d_n & \perp & c_j \\ & d_1 \dots d_j & \end{array}$, and $\begin{array}{ccc} ad_1 \dots d_n & \perp & c_j \\ & d_1 \dots d_n & \end{array}$. By transitivity, $\begin{array}{ccc} ad_1 \dots d_n & \perp & c_j \\ & d_1 \dots d_j & \end{array}$. A contradiction to the assumption that $\phi_j(a, y_j)$ forks over $d_1 \dots d_j$. The proof of Subclaim 8.5 is complete.

Since the extension property is first-order for T , the relation Λ_0 defined by $\Lambda_0(d_1, \dots, d_n) \equiv \forall a \Lambda(a, d_1, \dots, d_n)$ is type-definable. Now, clearly for all $d_1, \Gamma'(d_1)$ iff

$$\bigwedge_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=0}^{n-1} \in L} \forall d_2 \dots d_n (\neg \Lambda_0(d_1, \dots, d_n) \rightarrow \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \eta_j(d_1 \dots d_n, y_j) \text{ dnfo } d_1 \dots d_j).$$

Now, if $n = 1$ then this is clearly τ^f -closed. If $n > 1$, then we finish by the induction hypothesis.

Corollary 8.6 *Assume the extension property is first-order in T . Let $m \leq l < \omega$ and let $d_1^*, \dots, d_m^* \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\theta \in L$ and $\phi_i \in L$ for $i \leq l$. Let V be defined by*

$$V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } [\theta(a, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^l (\phi_i(a, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_i)].$$

Then the set U defined by

$$U(d_{m+1}) \text{ iff } \exists a \exists d_{m+2} \dots d_l V(a, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)$$

is a τ^f -open set over $d_1^* \dots d_m^*$.

Proof: By Fact 2.7, there are formulas $\{\psi_j(\tilde{x}, w_j) \in L(d_1^* \dots d_m^*)\}_{j \in J}$ such that

$$\forall a \left[\bigwedge_{i=0}^m (\phi_i(a, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1^* d_2^* \dots d_i^*) \text{ iff } \bigvee_{j \in J} (\psi_j(a, w_j) \text{ forks over } d_1^* d_2^* \dots d_m^*) \right].$$

Therefore by Lemma 8.4 (since by Lemma 3.10, the extension property is first-order over $\bar{d}^*$ as well) U is a union over $j \in J$ of τ^f -open sets over $d_1^* d_2^* \dots d_m^*$.

Theorem 8.7 Assume the extension property is first-order in T . Then

1) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an unbounded $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set over $\emptyset$. Then there exists an unbounded τ^f -open set $\mathcal{U}^*$ over some finite set A^* such that $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. In fact, if $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$ is a pre- $\tilde{\tau}^f$ -set relation such that $\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \exists d_1 \dots d_l V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l)\}$, and $(d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*)$ is any maximal sequence (with respect to extension) such that $\exists d_{m+1} \dots d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)$ is unbounded, then

$$\mathcal{U}^* = \exists d_{m+1} \dots d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)$$

is a τ^f -open set over $d_1^* \dots d_m^*$.

2) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an unbounded $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set over $\emptyset$. Then there exists an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set $\mathcal{U}^*$ over some finite set A^* such that $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. In fact, if $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$ is a pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation such that $\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \exists d_1 \dots d_l V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l)\}$, and $(d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*)$ is any maximal sequence (with respect to extension) such that $\exists d_{m+1} \dots d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)$ is non-algebraic, then

$$\mathcal{U}^* = \exists d_{m+1} \dots d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)$$

is a basic τ_∞^f -open set over $d_1^* \dots d_m^*$.

Proof: By Remark 8.3, (2) is an immediate corollary of (1). It suffices, of course, to prove the second part of (1). T is PCFT by Corollary 3.13. Let $\bar{d}^* = d_1^* \dots d_m^*$. First, if $m = l$ then the assertion follows immediately by Fact 2.7. So, we may assume $m < l$. By maximality of $\bar{d}^*$, we know

$\exists d_{m+2} \dots d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d'_{m+1}, d_{m+2}, \dots d_l)$ is bounded (equivalently, a union of algebraic sets over $\bar{d}^*$) for every d'_{m+1} . Thus for every $a \in \mathcal{U}^*$, there exist $\chi_a(x, \bar{z}^*, z) \in L$, $k = k(\chi_a) < \omega$ and $d'_{m+1}(a) \in \mathcal{C}$, such that $\forall z \forall \bar{z}^* \exists =^k x \chi_a(x, \bar{z}^*, z)$ (*1) and $V(a, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d'_{m+1}(a), d_{m+2}, \dots d_l)$ for some $d_{m+2}, \dots d_l \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\chi_a(x, \bar{d}^*, d'_{m+1}(a))$ isolates the type $tp(a/\bar{d}^*, d'_{m+1}(a))$. Let $\Xi = \{\chi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{U}^*}$. For $\chi \in \Xi$, let $k = k(\chi)$ and let U_χ be the $\bar{d}^*$ -invariant set defined by $U_\chi(d_{m+1})$ iff

$$\exists \text{ distinct } a_1 \dots a_k \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^k \chi(a_j, \bar{d}^*, d_{m+1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^k \exists d_{m+2} \dots d_l V(a_j, \bar{d}^*, d_{m+1}, d_{m+2}, \dots d_l) \right]$$

Subclaim 8.8 U_χ is a τ^f -open set over $\bar{d}^*$.

Proof: Let V be given by:

$$V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a} [\theta(a, \tilde{a}, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^l (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_i)].$$

for some $\theta, \phi_i \in L$. Since T is PCFT, it is sufficient to show that there exists a τ^f -open set $W = W(x, z_{m+1}, \bar{d}^*)$ over $\bar{d}^*$ such that if U'_χ is defined by

$$U'_\chi(d_{m+1}) \text{ iff } \exists \text{ distinct } a_1 \dots a_k \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^k \chi(a_j, \bar{d}^*, d_{m+1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^k W(a_j, d_{m+1}, \bar{d}^*) \right]$$

then $U'_\chi = U_\chi$. To show this let W be defined by: $W(a, d_{m+1}, \bar{d}^*)$ iff

$$\exists \tilde{a} \exists d'_{m+2} \dots d'_l [\theta(a, \tilde{a}, d_1^*, d_2^*, \dots d_m^*, d_{m+1}, d'_{m+2}, \dots d'_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^l (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d'_1 d'_2 \dots d'_i)]$$

where d'_i is defined in the following way: for $1 \leq i \leq m$, d'_i denotes d_i^* , and d'_{m+1} denotes $d_{m+1}a$ (and the rest are quantified variables). First note that for all a, d_{m+1} with $a \in \text{acl}(d_{m+1}, \bar{d}^*)$, $W(a, d_{m+1}, \bar{d}^*)$ iff $\exists d_{m+2} \dots d_l V(a, \bar{d}^*, d_{m+1}, d_{m+2}, \dots d_l)$. Thus by (*1), $U'_\chi = U_\chi$. By Corollary 8.6, W is a τ^f -open set over $\bar{d}^*$. So, the proof of Subclaim 8.8 is complete.

Now, for each $\chi \in \Xi$ define $Y_\chi(x) \equiv \exists d_{m+1} (\chi(x, \bar{d}^*, d_{m+1}) \wedge U_\chi(d_{m+1}))$. Since T is PCFT, Subclaim 8.8 implies Y_χ is a τ^f -open set over $\bar{d}^*$. Note that by the definition of U_χ and (*1), $Y_\chi \subseteq \mathcal{U}^*$ for all $\chi \in \Xi$. Now, if $a \in \mathcal{U}^*$, then by the choice of $d'_{m+1}(a)$, χ_a and $k = k(\chi_a)$, we have $\chi_a(a, \bar{d}^*, d'_{m+1}(a)) \wedge U_{\chi_a}(d'_{m+1}(a))$. Thus $a \in Y_{\chi_a}$. Hence $\mathcal{U}^* = \bigcup_{\chi \in \Xi} Y_\chi$, and so $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a τ^f -open set over $\bar{d}^*$. The proof of Theorem 8.7 is complete.

9 Main Result

We apply the theorem in section 8 to prove a new theorem for countable simple theories in which the extension property is first-order. The theorem says the assumption that every non-algebraic element has a non-algebraic element of finite SU_{se} -rank (a variation of the SU_s -rank) in its definable closure implies the existence of an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set of bounded finite SU_{se} -rank. It is here that we apply compactness, indeed this is possible because we require our set to be only of bounded finite SU_{se} -rank rather than of bounded finite SU -rank. By the reduction in section 7 and a corollary of section 3 the existence of such a set implies the main result. In this section T is assumed to be a simple theory and we work in $\mathcal{C}$ unless otherwise stated.

Remark 9.1 *Note that by passing from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{C}^{eq}$ (and vice versa) simplicity, supersimplicity and unidimensionality are preserved (unidimensionality is less trivial, see [Claim 5.2, S1]).*

Definition 9.2 1) For $a \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ the SU_{se} -rank is defined by induction on α : if $\alpha = \beta + 1$, $SU_{se}(a/A) \geq \alpha$ if there exist $B_1 \supseteq B_0 \supseteq A$ such that $a \not\downarrow_{B_0}^{s} B_1$ and $SU_{se}(a/B_1) \geq \beta$. For limit α , $SU_{se}(a/A) \geq \alpha$ if $SU_{se}(a/A) \geq \beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.

2) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an A -invariant set. We write $SU_{se}(\mathcal{U}) = \alpha$ (the SU_{se} -rank of $\mathcal{U}$ is α) if $\text{Max}\{SU_{se}(p) \mid p \in S(A), p^C \subseteq \mathcal{U}\} = \alpha$. We say that $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU_{se} -rank if for some $n < \omega$, $SU_{se}(\mathcal{U}) = n$.

Remark 9.3 *Note that $SU_{se}(a/B) \leq SU_{se}(a/A)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ (this is the reason for introducing SU_{se}). Also, clearly $SU_s(a/A) \leq SU_{se}(a/A) \leq SU(a/A)$ for all a, A . Clearly $SU_{se}(a/A) = 0$ iff $SU_s(a/A) = 0$ iff $a \in \text{acl}(A)$ for all a, A .*

Theorem 9.4 *Let T be a countable simple theory in which the extension property is first-order and assume $Lstp = stp$ over sets. Let s be a sort such that $\mathcal{C}^s$ is not algebraic. Assume for every $a \in \mathcal{C}^s \setminus \text{acl}(\emptyset)$ there exists $a' \in \text{dcl}(a) \setminus \text{acl}(\emptyset)$ such that $SU_{se}(a') < \omega$. Then there exists an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set $\mathcal{U}$ over a finite set such that $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU_{se} -rank.*

Proof: By a way of contradiction assume the non-existence of an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set of bounded finite SU_{se} -rank over a finite set. It will be sufficient

to show $\exists a^* \in \mathcal{C}^s \setminus acl(\emptyset)$ such that for every $\emptyset$ -definable function f , either $f(a^*) \in acl(\emptyset)$ or $SU_{se}(f(a^*)) \geq \omega$. To show this, for every $\emptyset$ -definable function f and $n < \omega$, let

$$S_{f,n} = \{a \in \mathcal{C}^s \mid 0 < SU_{se}(f(a)) < n\}.$$

Subclaim 9.5 *For every non-empty $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^s$ (with $\mathcal{U} \cap acl(\emptyset) = \emptyset$) for all $\emptyset$ -definable function f , and $n < \omega$, there exists a non-empty $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap (\mathcal{C}^s \setminus S_{f,n})$.*

Assuming Subclaim 9.5 is true, let $((f_i, n_i) \mid i < \omega)$ be an enumeration of all such pairs (f, n) . By induction, let $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{C}^s \setminus acl(\emptyset)$, and let $\mathcal{U}_{i+1} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_i \cap (\mathcal{C}^s \setminus S_{f_i, n_i})$ be a non-empty $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set. Since each $\mathcal{U}_i$ is type-definable, by compactness $\bigcap_{i < \omega} \mathcal{U}_i \neq \emptyset$. So, any $a^* \in \bigcap_{i < \omega} \mathcal{U}_i$ will work.

Proof of Subclaim 9.5: Let $\mathcal{U}, (f, n)$ be as in Subclaim 9.5. Now, if there exists $a \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f(a) \in acl(\emptyset)$, let $\chi(x) \in L$ be algebraic such that $\chi(f(a))$. By letting $\mathcal{U}^* = \{a \in \mathcal{U} \mid \models \chi(f(a))\}$ we are done. Hence we may assume $f(a) \notin acl(\emptyset)$ for every $a \in \mathcal{U}$. Let $V(x, z_1, \dots, z_l)$ be a pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation such that

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a \mid \exists d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l)\}.$$

where V is defined by:

$$V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a} [\theta(a, \tilde{a}, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^l (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_i)]$$

for some $\theta(x, \tilde{x}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) \in L$ and stable $\phi_i(\tilde{x}, y_i) \in L$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$. Now, let V_f be defined by: for all $b, d_1, \dots, d_l \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$V_f(b, d_1, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } \exists a (b = f(a) \wedge V(a, d_1, \dots, d_l)).$$

Then, clearly V_f is a pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation. Let $\bar{d}^* = (d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*)$ be a maximal sequence, with respect to extension, ($m \leq l$) such that

$$\tilde{V}_f(v) \equiv \exists d_{m+1}, d_{m+2}, \dots, d_l V_f(v, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)$$

is non-algebraic, or equivalently unbounded (since $\mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$ and we assume $f(a) \notin acl(\emptyset)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$, the empty sequence satisfies this property). By

Theorem 8.7(2), $\tilde{V}_f(\mathcal{C})$ is a basic τ_∞^f -open set over $\bar{d}^*$. By our assumption $\tilde{V}_f(\mathcal{C})$ is not of bounded finite SU_{se} -rank. Thus there are a^* and $d_{m+1}^*, \dots, d_l^*$ such that $V(a^*, \bar{d}^*, d_{m+1}^*, \dots, d_l^*)$ and $SU_{se}(f(a^*)/\bar{d}^*) \geq n$. Let $E = \langle (c_i^*, e_i^*) | 1 \leq i \leq n \rangle$ be such that $f(a^*) \not\downarrow_{\bar{d}^* c_1^* e_1^* \dots c_i^*}^s e_i^*$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ (*1). Note that since both dcl and forking have finite character, we may assume that c_i^*, e_i^* are finite tuples. Let $\tilde{a}^*$ be such that:

$$\theta(a^*, \tilde{a}^*, d_1^*, d_2^*, \dots, d_l^*) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^l (\phi_i(\tilde{a}^*, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1^* d_2^* \dots d_i^*) \quad (*2).$$

Now, by maximality of $\bar{d}^*$, $f(a^*) \in acl(\bar{d}^* d_{m+1}^*)$. By taking a non-forking extension of $tp(E/acl(\bar{d}^* d_{m+1}^*))$ over $acl(d_1^* \dots d_l^* a^* \tilde{a}^*)$ we may assume that $a^* \tilde{a}^* d_1^* \dots d_l^* \downarrow_{\bar{d}^* d_{m+1}^*}^s E$ and (*1) and (*2) still hold. Thus $a^* \tilde{a}^* \downarrow_{d_1^* \dots d_i^*}^s d_1^* \dots d_i^* E$ for all $m+1 \leq i \leq l$. Hence by (*2), we conclude $\phi_i(\tilde{a}^*, y_i)$ forks over $d_1^* d_2^* \dots d_i^* E$ for all $m+1 \leq i \leq l$. By (*1) and symmetry of $\downarrow^s$ (Lemma 6.7), there are stable $\psi_i(x_i, w_i) \in L$ and $\emptyset$ -definable functions g_i, h_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that if $a_i^* = g_i(f(a^*), \bar{d}^* c_1^* e_1^* \dots c_i^*)$, and $b_i^* = h_i(e_i^*, \bar{d}^* c_1^* e_1^* \dots c_i^*)$, then $\psi_i(a_i^*, b_i^*)$ and $\psi_i(a_i^*, w_i)$ forks over $\bar{d}^* c_1^* e_1^* \dots c_i^*$. Now, let us define a relation V^* in the following way:

$$V^*(a, d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_n, e_n, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a}, \tilde{a}' = \tilde{a}'_1 \dots \tilde{a}'_n, \tilde{b}' = \tilde{b}'_1 \dots \tilde{b}'_n (\theta^* \wedge V_0 \wedge V_1 \wedge V_2)$$

where, θ^* is defined by: $\theta^*(a, \tilde{a}, \tilde{a}', \tilde{b}', d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_n, e_n, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l) \equiv$

$$\theta(a, \tilde{a}, d_1, \dots, d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n [\psi_i(\tilde{a}'_i, \tilde{b}'_i) \wedge (\tilde{a}'_i = g_i(f(a), d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_i) \wedge (\tilde{b}'_i = h_i(e_i, d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_i))],$$

V_0 is defined by:

$$V_0(\tilde{a}, d_1, \dots, d_m) \text{ iff } \bigwedge_{i=0}^m (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_i),$$

V_1 is defined by:

$$V_1(\tilde{a}', d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_n, e_n) \text{ iff } \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (\psi_i(\tilde{a}'_i, w_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_m c_1 e_1 \dots c_i),$$

and V_2 is defined by:

$$V_2(\tilde{a}, d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_n, e_n, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l) \text{ iff } \bigwedge_{i=m+1}^l (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 \dots d_m c_1 e_1 \dots c_n e_n d_{m+1} \dots d_i).$$

Note that V^* is a pre- $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set relation. Thus

$$\mathcal{U}^* = \{a \mid \exists d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_n, e_n, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l V^*(a, d_1, \dots, d_m, c_1, e_1, \dots, c_n, e_n, d_{m+1}, \dots, d_l)\}$$

is a $\tilde{\tau}_{st}^f$ -set. By the construction of $a^*, d_1^*, \dots, d_m^*, c_1^*, e_1^*, \dots, c_n^*, e_n^*, d_{m+1}^*, \dots, d_l^*$, $\mathcal{U}^* \neq \emptyset$. By the definition of $\mathcal{U}^*$, $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap (\mathcal{C}^s \setminus \mathcal{C}_{f,n}^s)$ (note that if $a \in \mathcal{U}^*$, then there are $d_1, \dots, d_m \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $SU_{se}(f(a)/d_1 \dots d_m) \geq n$ and thus by Remark 9.3, $SU_{se}(f(a)) \geq n$). So, the proof of Subclaim 9.5 is complete, and thus so is the proof of the theorem.

Theorem 9.6 *Let T be a countable imaginary simple unidimensional theory. Then T is supersimple.*

Proof: By adding countably many constants we may assume there exists $p_0 \in S(\emptyset)$ of SU -rank 1 (each of the assumptions is preserved, as well as the corollary). Now, by Remark 9.1 we may work in $\mathcal{C}^{eq}$. Fix a non-algebraic sort s . Since T is unidimensional and imaginary, by Fact 2.1 for every $a \in \mathcal{C}^s \setminus acl(\emptyset)$ there exists $a' \in dcl(a) \setminus acl(\emptyset)$ such that $tp(a')$ is p_0 -internal; thus $SU(a') < \omega$ and in particular $SU_{se}(a') < \omega$. By Corollary 3.5 the extension property is first-order in T . By Theorem 9.4, there exists an unbounded τ_∞^f -open set $\mathcal{U}$ over a finite set such that $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU_{se} -rank. By Lemma 7.5, T is supersimple.

Recall that a theory T has the *wnfcp* (=weak non finite cover property) if for each L -formula $\phi(x, y)$, the D_ϕ -rank is finite (equivalently, $\phi(x, y)$ is low in x) and definable (the D_ϕ -rank of a formula $\psi(x, a)$ is defined by: $D_\phi(\psi(x, a)) \geq 0$ if $\psi(x, a)$ is consistent; $D_\phi(\psi(x, a)) \geq \alpha + 1$ if for some b , $D_\phi(\psi(x, a) \wedge \phi(x, b)) \geq \alpha$ and $\phi(x, b)$ divides over a ; and for limit δ , $D_\phi(\psi(x, a)) \geq \delta$ if it is $\geq \alpha$ for all $\alpha < \delta$).

Corollary 9.7 *Let T be a countable imaginary simple unidimensional theory. Then T is low and thus has the wnfcp.*

Proof: By Fact 2.4, T has bounded finite SU -rank in any given sort. Thus the global D -rank of any sort is finite. Now, let $\phi(x, y) \in L$. Then $\phi(x, y)$ is low in x iff $\text{Sup}\{D(x = x, \phi(x, y), k) \mid k < \omega\} < \omega$. So, clearly every $\phi(x, y)$ is low in x . Thus T is low. By Corollary 3.5 the extension property is first-order in any unidimensional theory. We conclude T has the wnfc (see [BPV], Corollary 4.6).

References

- [BPV] I.Ben-Yaacov, A.Pillay, E.Vassiliev, Lovely pairs of models, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 122 (2003), no. 1-3.
- [H0] E.Hrushovski, Countable unidimensional stable theories are superstable, unpublished paper.
- [H1] E.Hrushovski, Unidimensional theories are superstable, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 50 (1990), pgs 117-138.
- [HKP] B.Hart, B.Kim and A.Pillay, Coordinatization and canonical bases in simple theories, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 65 (2000), pgs 293-309.
- [HP] E. Hrushovski, A. Pillay, Groups definable in local fields and pseudo-finite fields, *Israel J. Math.* 85 (1994), 203 - 262.
- [K1] B.Kim, Forking in simple unstable theories, *Journal of London Math. Society*, 57 (1998), pgs 257-267.
- [KP] B.Kim and A.Pillay, Simple theories, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 88, 1997 pgs 149-164.
- [P] A.Pillay, On countable simple unidimensional theories, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 68 (2003), no. 4.
- [P1] A.Pillay, The extension property holds in unidimensional simple theories, unpublished note.
- [S0] Z.Shami, Internality and interpretable automorphism groups in simple theories, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, Volume 129, Issues 1-3, October 2004, pgs 149-162.

- [S1] Z.Shami, Coordinatization by binding groups and unidimensionality in simple theories, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 69, no. 4, 2004, pgs. 1221-1242.
- [S2] Z.Shami, On analyzability in the forking topology for simple theories, *Annals of Pure Applied Logic* 142 (2006), no. 1-3, 115–124.
- [S3] Z.Shami, On Kueker simple theories, *J. Symbolic Logic* 70 (2005), no. 1, 216–222.
- [V] Evgueni Vassiliev, Generic pairs of SU-rank 1 structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 120 (2003) 103-149.
- [W] Frank O. Wagner, *Simple Theories*, Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2000.